Present: Dr Mehmet Kizil (in the Chair), Professor Andrej Atrens, Dr Mathew Cleary, Associate Professor Lydia Kavanagh, Professor Ross McAree, Mr Douglas Malcolm, Associate Professor Martin Veidt, Associate Professor Mingxing Zhang, Mrs Lamb.

Apologies: Associate Professor Vaughan Clarkson, Ms Cristina Ghiculescu, Professor David Mee (for Professor Richard Morgan), Associate Professor Andrew Morrell.

Minutes: The minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2010, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Business arising out of the minutes

- UQ 2010 Strategic Teaching and Learning Grants: There were no submissions received from the School; MECH3300 might be submitted for 2011 funding.
- Course changes: the Board of Studies in Engineering would consider the following at its first meeting in 2010:
  - External offerings for MINE7006/7007/7008/7027 (for 2010)
  - Change of semester for 2011 and beyond: MATE7001, ENGG7600
  - Change to Mechanical and Aerospace courses from 2011
  - The proposal to offer an #8 project in the Master of Engineering (Engineering Science) in Mechanical Engineering had been withdrawn.
- University-wide calculator scheme: feedback had been sent to the Associate Dean (Academic) on 22 February as the Faculty had planned to send a consolidated response to the President of the Academic Board.
- The application for School Teaching and Learning awards would be developed shortly

1. Errors in Examination Papers

At the meeting of the School’s Teaching and Learning Committee held on 16 September 2009, members had discussed errors in Semester 1 2009 examination papers which had been prepared by the University’s Examinations Section and reviewed by the University’s Assessment Subcommittee and the DVC (Academic). Members had discussed the current business process to review papers which included review of the complete paper by another member of academic staff and subsequent sign off by the divisional chief examiner. Additional administrative checks had been made by School administrative staff. It had also been suggested that the course coordinator, another academic or a postgraduate tutor attempt the examination prior to submission to decrease the amount of errors that resulted from poorly worded or incomplete questions. It had been agreed that administrative assistance would be provided for the coversheets and submission sheet to allow the academic staff additional time to proofread the academic content of the paper.

Members reviewed the subsequent report that had been prepared regarding Semester 2 2009 examination papers.

Of 25 papers submitted for printing, 11 (44%) contained errors which had been identified by Examinations Section staff prior to printing. These errors were largely administrative in nature and included late submission of papers, formatting errors, unclear instructions and missing information (e.g. formula sheets). A smaller number of papers contained errors related to content of the question. Members agreed the following actions should be taken to lessen errors on examination papers--

- The submission of late papers could be remedied by ensuring that all papers are submitted by the due date (7 May in Semester 1 2010);
- Formatting errors could be reduced by more careful review of the paper prior to submission;
- Reducing the unclear instructions – those picked up in Examinations Section were likely to be more administrative in nature; however, consultation with academic staff would be required if School staff identify a possible issue;
- Missing information (e.g. graph paper, formula sheets) could be remedied by careful review of the paper prior to submission. However, what was required will need to be clearly identified on the cover sheet;
- Ensure each Division had nominated a Chief Examiner who had a key role in checking papers thoroughly; and
- Lodge model answers with each paper.
1. **Errors in Examination Papers** (cont’d)

   It was resolved that –

   (i) course coordinators be sent an email regarding the need to reduce errors including the examination paper preparation checklist used by Examinations Section; and

   (ii) more thorough administrative checks on examination papers be done.

2. **Course Changes**

2a. **MECH2301**

   At the meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee held on 12 February 2010, members had endorsed the change of course code from MECH2301 to MINE 2123 from Semester 1 2011. Subsequent to the meeting, it was decided to seek additional changes, viz a change in course title and course description to better reflect the discipline descriptor of ‘mining’ (MINE).

   Mining students fundamentally needed to gain a working knowledge of the theory of structural mechanics in order to be able to undertake calculations in areas of engineering structural design, particularly in mining engineering applications. Over the past few years, many mining students had struggled in this course, mainly due to the lack of adequate links between the course structure and their discipline and the poor utilisation of their learning in analysing mining problems. A quick review of students’ feedback indicated that many mining students had been under the impression that this is a mechanical engineering course.

   In order to change the first impression of students towards the course, it was suggested that the following additional changes be made to the course from Semester 1 2011.

   - Course name: change from “Structural Mechanics” to “Structural Mechanics for Mining”;
   - Course description: revised to “Basic concepts of deformations, deflections and internal stresses within structures; fundamental theory of loads and their effects on structural materials and elements in terms of stress and strain; and design methods of structural members with applications in mining engineering problems”; 
   - Course coordinator: change to a member of Mining Engineering Staff (Dr Saiied Aminossadati).

   The content of the MINE2123 would remain the same as that for the existing offering (MECH2301); however, a new mining project and more practical mining examples would be incorporated in the course. Members noted that the changes had been endorsed by the current course coordinators and Mechanical Engineering staff.

   It was resolved to recommend that–

   (i) MECH2301 be recoded as MINE2123;
   (ii) the course be renamed as “Structural Mechanics for Mining”;
   (iii) the course description be amended to better reflect its mining engineering content;
   (iv) the course coordinator be Dr Saiied Aminossadati; and
   (v) the changes take effect from Semester 1 2011.

2b. **Course name changes – ENGG7601/7602**

   Members considered the proposal to amend the course names for ENGG7601 (Advanced Engineering Laboratory I) and ENGG7602 (Advanced Engineering Laboratory II) from Semester 1, 2011. The rationale was that current names implied that the courses were taken in order, when it was more usual that ENGG7602 was taken first. In addition, it was desirable to ensure that the name of the course more accurately reflected its content. It was therefore proposed that ENGG7601 be renamed “Experimental Design” and ENGG7602 become “Advanced Engineering Laboratory Techniques”.
2. **Course Changes**

2b. **Course name changes – ENGG7601/7602**

   It was **resolved to recommend** that—
   
   (i) ENGG7601 (Advanced Engineering Laboratory I) be renamed as “Experimental Design”;
   
   (ii) ENGG7602 (Advanced Engineering Laboratory II) – be renamed as “Advanced Engineering Laboratory Techniques”; and
   
   (iii) the changes take effect from Semester 1 2011.

3. **University of Queensland Teaching Awards**

   The University of Queensland fostered and acknowledged excellence in its learning and teaching environment by recognising and rewarding its academic and general staff through three annual award programs -

   - Awards for Teaching Excellence
   - Awards for Programs that Enhance Learning
   - Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning

   Members noted that nominations for the 2010 award programs were due to the Office of the DVC (Academic) by the closing date of Friday 23 April and also noted that the Faculty had an earlier deadline as the Faculty’s Teaching and Learning Committee/Associate Dean (Academic) was responsible for ranking nominations for central consideration.

   A staff member from Mining Engineering had already been nominated for an Award for Teaching Excellence and it was agreed that a staff member from Mechanical Engineering would also be nominated; a nomination from Materials Engineering would also be considered.

   A/Professor Kavanagh and Dr Kizil offered to share their previous applications with the nominees and it was also agreed that it would be beneficial to speak with the Associate Dean (Academic) prior to submission of other nominations.

   It was also agreed that nominations for school and faculty teaching awards would form the basis of University level awards in future.

4. **Course and Teaching Evaluations**

   Prior to the release of the new course and teaching evaluations, a trial had undertaken in three of the School’s courses which had been taught in Semester 2 2009 (i.e. ENGG7601, MECH4460 and MINE4125). Members noted that only one course met the University’s minimal expectations (MINE4125). It was noted that, from Semester 1 2010, the former survey instruments used to evaluate teachers (TEVALs and iCEVALs) had been replaced by the SET-C (Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course) which was available in four formats:

   - SECaT - for a course taught by a single staff member;
   - SECaTs - for a course taught by more than one staff member;
   - SETutor - for an individual tutor; and
   - Open Response Questionnaire - for classes with less than 6 possible responses.

   Under the new policies for student evaluations, every course would be evaluated each time it was offered using one of the SET-C surveys. TEDI’s Evaluations Unit would continue to provide the materials for the paper based survey and provide subsequent reports following each semester’s evaluations. Students enrolled in all courses would be invited to evaluate their courses and their teachers using SET-C at a time designated by the course coordinator between weeks 10 and 13 in Semester 1 and Semester 2, and between weeks 6 and 7 in Summer Semester. The new surveys would allow students to provide feedback on the course and teaching through a single instrument.
4. Course and Teaching Evaluations (cont’d)

The following changes to the process were also noted -

- SET-C surveys would be scheduled automatically in each teaching period for all courses and the associated staff who are identified as teachers on those courses. This will be based on information contained within the Electronic Course Profile (ECP) system for each instance of a course.
- For administrative staff, TEDI would no longer issue a call for iCEVAL orders each semester. Instead, information would be sent to School Administration Officers to be checked and verified early in the semester in consultation with the Chairs of Teaching and Learning Committees.
- For academic staff (other than tutors), the placing of orders for teaching evaluation surveys was no longer required.
- Tutors would continue to evaluate their teaching by placing a request on the Evaluation Services Unit (ESU) for a survey for their tutorial(s).
- Classes with fewer than 6 enrolments would not be subjected to a survey but an open-ended response questionnaire will be available for use in these courses.
- SECaT/s outcomes would be provided to the course coordinator and all members of teaching staff on a course, with a summary of all teaching and course evaluations being sent to the head of school.
- Summaries of the course evaluations would also be provided to chairs of school teaching and learning committees and Associate Deans (Academic) and, as was currently the case, outcomes would be made accessible through a secure website (the Reportal) and the CTQA dashboard.


It was resolved that –

(i) the Secretary collect and collate information from course coordinators to enable all surveys to be performed on time; and
(ii) the Committee review results each semester.

5. U21 Undergraduate Research Conference

Each year Universitas 21 (U21) hosted two main student events that UQ actively supported including the U21 Undergraduate Research Conference and the U21 Summer School (details of the Summer School were not yet available.)

The 2010 Undergraduate Research Conference was scheduled to be held at the University of Melbourne from 1 – 7 July at the Parkville Campus in Melbourne. This year’s theme was “Faculty of Imagining, inspired by the creative genius of Albert Einstein, who celebrated imagination as being ‘more important than knowledge’. Imagination facilitated meaning and understanding and is fundamental to the development of quality research across multiple disciplines.”

UQ was invited to nominate up to three participants, one of whom would make an oral presentation, one a poster presentation, and the third could do either. (Nominations from students should identify what form of presentation they were seeking to make). It was expected that all UQ participants would be required to make their papers available for publication in Oculus, produced by the University of Virginia. While the details of funding had not yet been finalised, it was anticipated the University would fund the travel and accommodation costs for up to three students and one member of academic staff to attend the conference. There was no registration cost in 2010. Each faculty was invited to make one student nomination and the final selection of three delegates would be based upon a number of criteria including academic merit and the quality of abstracts presented by the students.
5. **U21 Undergraduate Research Conference (cont’d)**

All nominees must be either outstanding current honours students, or recent graduates who had attained Honours Class I, and who had been enrolled in honours in Semester 2, 2009. Faculties must be confident the nominees had the ability to make a 10 minute oral presentation or deliver a poster session at the conference. Nominees would be required to prepare a brief abstract (150-200 word) of their proposed presentation as part of the nomination process. Members noted that students in the School with a GPA of 6.2 or higher had been emailed about this opportunity. Nominations were due to the Faculty by 19 April 2010. It was also agreed that eligible students be approached to encourage them to self-nominate.

6. **First Year Engineering – choice of specialisation**

The Executive Dean had met with the Director, First Year and the Associate Dean (Academic) concerning the representation of the various disciplines in the first year of the Bachelor of Engineering. It had been agreed that a set of activities were required that:

- allowed the schools to 'market' themselves;
- allowed undecided students to choose their discipline; and
- confirmed the choice of those students who had already decided upon their discipline.

It was agreed that ENGG1000 projects (and good project leaders) were a very good vehicle for showcasing engineering disciplines and it was noted that the extra civil engineering topic was fully booked and others (e.g. Mechanical) might consider offering two projects in 2011 because of the high demand for the mechanical engineering project in 2010. A 'Discipline Expo', which would be either an afternoon or an evening where the students could talk with academics and students from the various disciplines had also been suggested; however, members did not support this suggestion. Instead, the inclusion of first year students at the industry evening was offered as an alternative suggestion.

Members endorsed the continuance of the discipline lunches that the schools had coordinated in the first half of Semester 2 2009.

Members also expressed the view that ‘marketing’ schools, in particular via ENGG1000, should not the implied intention of these events. Instead, it was important to couch these events in terms of ‘allowing students to be provided with sufficient information to make an informed choice of their engineering specialisation’.

It was also agreed that the Engineering prospectuses be given to students, rather than individual discipline flyers, and that use be made of the various TV screens in the Engineering precinct to provide students with additional information on specialisation.

7. **Choice of BE specialisation**

Members noted the preliminary indication of student choice of specialisation from the 673 students who had recently undertaken competency testing in ENGG1000.

- Chemical (including Chemical and Biological, Chemical and Metallurgical, Chemical and Materials): 68 (11%)
- Civil: 107 (17%)
- Environmental: 14 (2%)
- Mechanical (including Mechanical and Aerospace, Mechanical and Materials): 107 (17%)
- Mechatronics: 57 (9%)
- Mining: 17 (2%)
- Electrical (including Electrical and Aerospace, Electrical and Biomedical): 64 (10%)
- Software: 12 (2%)
- Computer systems: 11 (2%)
- Don’t know: 156 (25%)
- Other: 9 (1%)

It was noted that student feedback was being used to improve ENGG1000.
10. Terms of Reference - Mapping

At the meeting of the Committee on 17 February 2010, members had endorsed the membership and terms of reference for the School of Mechanical and Mining Engineering’s Teaching and Learning Committee and noted the roles and responsibilities of school teaching and learning committees within the Faculty. It had been agreed that the Secretary would map the roles and responsibilities to the terms of reference and identify any items that were not covered in the terms of reference. The information was contained in the following list (terms of reference in italics).

Roles and Responsibilities of School Teaching & Learning Committees
Caroline Crosthwaite, Associate Dean (Academic)

School Teaching and Learning Committees are responsible for promoting excellence in teaching and enhancing and assuring the quality of teaching and learning in Schools. Specifically, this includes:

1. Leadership:

   - Providing leadership and support to staff to improve teaching effectiveness and student learning in the context of University policy.
     - matters relating to teaching and learning and assessment in the School and improving the quality of teaching and learning as articulated in the School’s Operational Plan
   - Leading, supporting and promoting the adoption of best practice and innovation in learning, teaching and assessment.
     - matters relating to teaching and learning and assessment in the School and improving the quality of teaching and learning as articulated in the School’s Operational Plan
   - Identifying emerging teaching and learning issues and opportunities of relevance to the School.
     - matters relating to teaching and learning and assessment in the School and improving the quality of teaching and learning as articulated in the School’s Operational Plan
   - Developing and implementing the School’s Teaching and Learning Strategic Plan in accordance with Faculty and University planning in this area.
     - matters relating to teaching and learning and assessment in the School and improving the quality of teaching and learning as articulated in the School’s Operational Plan
   - Encouraging, recognising and rewarding high quality teaching and learning.
     - matters relating to teaching and learning and assessment in the School and improving the quality of teaching and learning as articulated in the School’s Operational Plan
   - Publicising teaching and learning achievements within the School, University and wider communities.
     - matters relating to teaching and learning and assessment in the School and improving the quality of teaching and learning as articulated in the School’s Operational Plan

2. Quality Assurance:

   - Ensuring teaching and learning practices accord with University policy and University, Faculty and School procedures.
     - school and curriculum development and needs, including accreditation requirements, course and program changes.
     - other matters related to the development and enhancement of teaching and learning.
   - Monitoring all aspects of assessment including assessment design, examination paper preparation, moderation of results, and finalisation of grades.
     - Set and monitor effective quality processes (e.g. annual CTQA review, Electronic Course Profiles, academic advising, student staff liaison). Note that the Committee does not manage examination paper preparation but does discuss ways to ensure quality assessment processes. Finalisation of results is done at examiners’ meetings.
   - Overseeing the checking of course profiles.
10. Terms of Reference – Mapping (cont’d)

- Set and monitor effective quality processes (e.g. annual CTQA review, Electronic Course Profiles, academic advising, student staff liaison). Note that checking profiles each semester is done at the divisional level with administrative assistance.

- Preparing for program, course, School reviews, and accreditation where appropriate.
  - School and curriculum development and needs, including accreditation requirements, course and program changes.

3. Management:

- Overseeing all major changes to the School’s courses and programs.
  - School and curriculum development and needs, including accreditation requirements, course and program changes.

- Providing the School with analysis and advice on pedagogical issues.
  - Other matters related to the development and enhancement of teaching and learning.

- Identifying and coordinating staff development needs to enhance the quality of teaching, learning and assessment, academic guidance and learner support.
  - Other matters related to the development and enhancement of teaching and learning.

- Advising the Head of School where appropriate on resources required for teaching and learning, including the School’s teaching and learning budget and allocation of teaching loads.
  - Annual teaching and learning budget including strategic funding from the faculty and/or University

- Ensuring effective communication between academic and administrative staff in the area of teaching and learning.
  - Other matters related to the development and enhancement of teaching and learning.

Members agreed that the School’s terms of reference adequately covered the roles and responsibilities and should remain as written.